

Response/Amendment  
App. S/N: 10/048,124  
Attorney Docket No. 4383 P

OFFICE ACTION RESPONSE  
and AMENDMENT

Examiner: Behrooz M. Senfi  
Group Art Unit: 2613  
Confirmation No.: 2728

Remarks

The numbered paragraphs of the office action are responded to through the corresponding numbered paragraphs below. The applicant has addressed each issue in turn and, for clarity, has provided a heading for each issue.

1. The Examiner noted that based on a phone conversation claims 1-25 are selected for prosecution. The applicant has requested that claims 26-33 be withdrawn from this application.

*Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103*

2. The Examiner provided the quotation of "35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action." The applicant believes that no response is required for this paragraph.

3. The Examiner rejected claims 1-16 and 26 under "35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thro et al. (US 6,037,991) in view of Robb et al. (WO 97/26744). The applicant has requested that claim 26 be withdrawn and that claim 1, on which claims 2-16 depend, be amended to more clearly point out the inclusion of a motion detector means for generating a warning signal that is used by the interface module to provide an alert signal to the handheld portable monitor. Moreover, applicant's invention as presently claimed facilitates one particular advantage of applicant's invention, that is the point to point nature of the transmission from the video recording means to the handheld portable monitor, without requiring the base station essential to Thro and

Response/Amendment  
App. S/N: 10/048,124  
Attorney Docket No. 4383 P

OFFICE ACTION RESPONSE  
and AMENDMENT

Examiner: Behrooz M. Senfi  
Group Art Unit: 2613  
Confirmation No.: 2728

implied by Hansen. The applicant believes that these claims as currently pending are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references, either alone or in combination. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

4. The Examiner rejected claims 17-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) "as being unpatentable over Thro et al. (US 6,037,991) in view of Robb et al. (WO 97/26744) further in view of Hansen et al. (US 6,628,805). As noted above, the applicant has requested claim 1, on which claims 17-25 depend, be amended to more clearly show that the applicant's invention includes a motion detector means for generating a warning signal that is used by the interface module to provide an alert signal to a handheld portable monitor, in a point to point transmission of video information from the video recorder to the handheld portable monitor. The applicant respectfully asserts that Hansen's user interface 406 is in no way a portable monitor as claimed in applicants present claims.

*Conclusion*

5. The Examiner provided information concerning communication on this case. The applicant appreciates the Examiner's willingness to communicate and assist in this case.

The applicant has requested that claims 1 (on which claims 2-25 depend), 19, 24 and 25 and be amended as previously described and that claims 17, 19 and 23 be

Response/Amendment  
App. S/N: 10/048,124  
Attorney Docket No. 4383 P

OFFICE ACTION RESPONSE  
and AMENDMENT

Examiner: Behrooz M. Senfi  
Group Art Unit: 2613  
Confirmation No.: 2728

cancelled.. In view of the foregoing, and in summary, the applicant believes that all issues and points of the Examiner's Office Action have been addressed and that the newly amended claims and all claims dependent on these claims are patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted this 20th day of April, 2004.



Lloyd W. Sadler, Reg. No. 40,154  
PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER  
201 South Main Street, Suite 1800  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
Telephone: (801) 532-1234  
Facsimile: (801) 536-6111